

One of the overlooked aspects of the war we are now fighting is the awakening it has spawned on the left. In one atrocity, Osama bin Laden may have accomplished what a generation of conservative writers have failed to do: convince mainstream liberals of the illogic and nihilism of the powerful postmodern left. For the first time in a very long while, many liberals are reassessing—quietly for the most part—their alliance with the anti-American, anti-capitalist forces they have long appeased, ignored or supported.

COLLECTIVE KNEE

Of course the initial response of left-wing intellectuals to Sept. 11 was one jerking of the collective knee. This was America's fault. From Susan Sontag to Michael Moore, from Noam Chomsky to Edward Said, there was no question that, however awful the attack on the World Trade Center, it was vital to keep attention fixed on the real culprit: the United States. Of the massacre, a Rutgers professor summed up the consensus by informing her students that "We should be aware that, whatever its proximate cause, its ultimate cause is the fascism of U.S. foreign policy over the past many decades." Or as a poster at the demonstration in Washington last weekend put it, "Amerika, Get A Clue."

Less noticed was the reasoned stance of liberal groups like the National Organization for Women. President Kim Candy stated that "The Taliban government of Afghanistan, believed to be harboring suspect Osama bin Laden, subjugates women and girls, and deprives them of the most basic human rights—including education, medicine and jobs. The smoldering remains of the World Trade Center are a stark reminder that when such extremism is allowed to flourish anywhere in the world, none of us is safe." The NAACP issued an equally forceful "message of resolve," declaring, "These tragedies and these acts of evil must not go unpunished. Justice must be served."

Left-wing dissident Christopher Hitchens, meanwhile, assailed his comrades as "soft on crime and soft on fascism." After an initial spasm of equivocation, the American Prospect magazine ran a column this week accusing the pre-emptive peace movement of "a truly vile form of moral equivalency" in equating President Bush with terrorists. Not a hard cell, but daring for a magazine that rarely has even a civil word for the right.

Most moving was Salman Rushdie's early call in the New York Times to "be clear about why this bien-pensant anti-American onslaught is such appalling rubbish. Terrorism is the murder of the innocent; this time, it was mass murder. To excuse such an atrocity by blaming U.S. government policies is to deny the basic idea of all morality: that individuals are responsible for their actions." Whatever else is going on, the liberal-left alliance has taken as big a hit as the conservative-fundamentalist alliance after the blame-America remarks of Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson.

It's not hard to see why. Unlike previous Cold War battles, this one is against an enemy with no pretense at any universal, secular ideology that could appeal to Western liberals. However, repulsive, the communist arguments of, say, Ho Chi Minh or Fidel Castro still appealed to a secular, Western ideology. American leftist could delude themselves that they shared the same struggle.

But with Osama bin Laden, and the Islamo-fascism of the Taliban, no such delusions are possible. The American liberal mind has long believed that their prime enemy in America is the religious right, what does that make the Taliban? They sub-

jugate women with a brutality rare even in the Muslim world; they despite Jews; they execute homosexuals by throwing them from very high buildings or crushing them underneath stone walls. There is literally nothing that the left can credibly cling to in rationalizing support for these hate-filled fanatics.

This is therefore an excruciating moment for the postmodern, post-colonial left. They may actually have come across an enemy that even they cannot argue is morally superior to the West. You see this discomfort in the silence of the protestors in Washington, who simply never raised the issue of bin Laden's ideology. You see it is Barbara Ehrenreich's sad plea in the *Village Voice*: "What is so heartbreaking to me as a feminist is that the strongest response to corporate globalization and U.S. military domination is based on such a violent and misogynist ideology."

You see it in the words of Fredric Jameson, a revered postmodernist at Duke University, arguing in the *London Review of Books* that the roots of the conflict are to be found "in the wholesale massacres of the Left systematically encouraged and directed by the Americans in an even earlier period It is, however, only now that the results are working their way out into actuality, for the resultant absence of any Left alternative means that popular revolt and resistance in the Third World have nowhere to go but into religious and 'fundamentalist' forms." The only adequate description of this argument is desperate. And, of course, it ducks the hard question. What does the left do now that these forces are indeed fundamentalist?

The other rhetorical trope that is fast disintegrating is the anti-racist argument. The doctrine of "post-colonialism" which now dominates many American humanities departments invariably sides with Third World regimes against the accumulated evil of the West. So the emergence of the Taliban is a body-blow. If dark-skinned peoples are inherently better than light-skinned peoples, then how does a dark-skinned culture come up with an ideology that is clearly a function of bigotry, misogyny and homophobia?

One immediate response is to argue that the U.S. itself created Osama bin Laden in its war against Soviet communism. This isn't true—but even if it were, doesn't this fact, as Mr. Hitchens has argued, actually increase the West's responsibility to retaliate against him?

WHAT SUPPRESSION?

It may be, in fact, that one of the silver linings of these awful times is that the far left's bluff has been finally called. War focuses issues in ways peace cannot.

Leftists would like to pretend that any criticism of their views raises the spectre of domestic repression. But in a country with a First Amendment, no suppression from government is likely, and in the citadels of the media and the academy, the far left is actually vastly over-represented. The real issue, as pointed out this week by Britain's Labour prime minister, is that some on the left have expressed "a hatred of America that shames those that feel it."

The left's howls of anguish are therefore essentially phony—and they stem from a growing realization that this crisis has largely destroyed the credibility of the far left. Forced to choose between the West and the Taliban, the hard left simply cannot decide. Far from concealing this ideological bankruptcy, we need to expose it and condemn it as widely and as irrevocably as we can. Many liberals are already listening and watching—and the tectonic plates of politics are shifting as they do.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COBRA COVERAGE ACT OF 2001

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of a piece of legislation that I believe is an essential component of our efforts to help those affected by the attacks of September 11th. My bill, the COBRA Coverage Act of 2001, will provide a 50 percent tax credit toward COBRA coverage for laid-off workers. I believe this is the best way for us to ensure that the thousands of Americans recently laid-off do not go without health insurance.

Under current law, commonly referred to as COBRA, workers who are laid off are allowed to remain in their employer-based health insurance plan for up to 18 months, provided they pay the full premium for the plan (their share plus the employer share) plus a small administrative fee. The problem is, the full premium for employment-based coverage averages almost \$2,500 per year for self-only coverage and about \$6,500 per year for family coverage.

Since COBRA coverage is very expensive, many laid-off workers let their insurance lapse, gambling that they won't get sick or injured before they find another job. We cannot continue to allow so many hard-working Americans and their families to go uninsured. We must find a way to make COBRA coverage more affordable for the thousands of laid-off workers trying to recover from the September 11th attacks.

And my bill does exactly that. The COBRA Coverage Act of 2001 provides continuing health care coverage for laid-off workers at half the price. Under this legislation, laid-off workers would be eligible for a tax credit for 50 percent toward the COBRA coverage premium. The credit would be limited to a maximum of \$110 for an individual and \$290 for a family per month, and would be administered by the employer. This way, workers can receive an immediate benefit and would not have to wait until the end of the year to claim tax credit.

Now, more than ever, we must ensure that American families can afford to remain insured in case of sickness or injury. We must take the lead in ensuring that the thousands of hard-working Americans who have fallen victim to the effects of the September 11th attacks are not set back even further by the lack of health insurance. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to make COBRA coverage more affordable for our laid-off workers.

THE FARM SECURITY ACT

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, my office has been contacted by dozens of groups expressing concerns about the Farm Security Act (H.R. 2646). I submit the following letter on their behalf.

OCTOBER 2, 2001.

Dear Representative: The one hundred forty-eight (148) groups listed below, from

across the country representing family farmers and ranchers, sustainable agriculture, religious communities, environmental and wildlife concerns, consumers, and many other constituencies and issues have joined forces to urge you to vote against the Farm Security Act of 2001 (H.R. 2646). As agricultural and rural groups, we make this urgent plea to vote against a farm bill with great reluctance. However, this bill proposed by the House Agriculture Committee would continue and expand misguided policies that have driven commodity program spending to record high levels, while doing little to stem family farm decline and falling far short of providing solutions to the many conservation, rural development, credit, research and other needs of America's farmers, ranchers, and their communities. This nation needs a Farm Bill that works for family farms, ranchers, rural communities, consumers and the environment. Unfortunately, H.R. 2646 fails to do this.

Specifically, H.R. 2646 would:

Unfairly subsidize the nation's very largest farms, while encouraging overproduction, low prices, environmental distress, and large government payments in perpetuity.

Ignore the need for a competition title to address the impact of rapid consolidation in agriculture and to check anti-competitive behavior that harms farm and ranch families, consumers, rural communities and the environment.

Transform the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) into a subsidy program for huge, polluting, factory livestock operations.

Ignore the needs of beginning farmers and ranchers.

Cap and severely limit funds for conservation technical assistance for the Conservation Reserve and Wetlands Reserve Programs.

Weaken the highly successful Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP).

Phase out within the next five years nearly all direct lending programs within USDA.

Fail to increase the percentage of total farm bill funds dedicated to conservation, and ignore the calls for a comprehensive stewardship incentive program for working land.

Take only minimal steps to support marketing innovation and development and value-adding enterprises and to reverse the decline in public support for agricultural research.

Fail to address structural changes essential to assure fair and equitable delivery of USDA programs and services to all farmers, despite costly legal settlements brought on by USDA actions.

The results would do substantial harm to family farms, to our communities and the environment. For years, family farmers and ranchers and concerned citizens have been developing solutions to agricultural problems and putting them into practice on their farms and in their communities. In our view, the bill reported out by the House Agriculture Committee not only ignores these solutions, but in fact would make them more difficult to achieve.

H.R. 2646 was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee in July 2001 after just 15 hours of debate. Federal policy affecting our nation's agriculture system and food supply for the next ten years is much too important to be pushed through in a matter of days. This bill must go back to the House Agriculture Committee for the substantial debate and policy development process our nation needs and deserves.

At a minimum, a new round of deliberations on the Farm Bill by the House Agriculture Committee should include:

Removal of biases against small and moderate-scale agriculture, and assuring that all farmers receive equitable access and service.

Comprehensive assistance for all small-scale, socially disadvantaged and new farmers and ranchers not served by current programs.

Restoration of direct lending for all family-size farms.

Stewardship incentives for family farmers that provide real conservation and environmental benefits for our society.

Rural development, research and marketing programs that increase the farm and ranch share of food system profit and support development of new cooperative and small businesses.

Commodity programs that enable family farms to earn a fair price.

A competition title to increase competition and fairness in the domestic agricultural marketplace.

We respectfully request that you vote no on H.R. 2646.

Alabama Sustainable Agriculture Network.

Alternative Energy Resources Organization (AERO).

Agricultural Resources Center.

American Corn Growers Association.

Arkansas Natural Produce, Inc.

Ashland Community Food Store.

Berkeley Ecology Center (CA).

Berkeley Farmers' Market (CA).

Beyond Organic Communications.

Cabinet Mountain Market (MT).

California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF).

California Church IMPACT.

California Farmers Union.

California Institute for Rural Studies.

California Sustainable Agriculture Working Group.

California Wilderness Coalition.

C.A.S.A. de Llano (Communities Approaching Sustainable Agriculture) (TX).

C.A.T.A., Farmworker Support Committee (NJ).

Campaign for Contract Agriculture Reform.

Carolina Farm Stewardship Association.

Center for Earth Spirituality and Rural Ministry, School Sisters of Notre Dame (MN).

Center for Food and Justice, Urban and Environmental Policy Institute, Occidental College.

Center for Rural Affairs (NE).

Center for Sustainable Systems (KY).

Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana.

Coalition for the Bight (NY).

Coastal Enterprises, Inc. (ME).

Colorado Organic Producers Association.

Columbia Area Food Circle (MO).

Community Farm Alliance (KY).

Community Food Security Coalition.

Community Market Gardens.

Consumer Federation of America.

Corporate Agribusiness Research Project.

Dakota Resource Council.

Dakota Rural Action (SD).

Delta Land and Community.

Demeter Association.

Earthfriends.

Eden Foods, Inc.

Erehwon Retreat (NY).

Family Farm Defenders.

Family Farms for the Future (MO).

Farming Alternatives Program at Cornell University.

Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund.

Florida Organic Growers.

Food Works (VT).

Friends of Rural Alabama, Inc.

Friends of the Earth.

GRACE Public Fund (Global Resource Action Center for the Environment).

Green Eggers Farm (MS).

Greenpeace USA.

Henry A. Wallace Center for Agricultural and Environmental Policy at Winrock International.

Hoosier Environmental Council.

Idaho Organic Alliance.

Illinois Stewardship Alliance.

Indiana National Farmers Organization.

Innovative Farmers of Ohio.

Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement.

Iowa Environmental Council.

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy.

Johnny's Selected Seeds (ME).

Just Food (NY).

Kansas City Food Circle.

Kansas Rural Center.

Maine Farms Project.

Maine Organic Farmers & Gardeners Association (MOFGA).

Maysie's Farm Conservation Center (PA).

McCone Agriculture Protection Organization.

Michael Fields Agricultural Institute.

Midwest Organic and Sustainable Education Services (MOSES).

Minnesota Project.

Minnesota Food Association.

Mississippi 2020 Network, Inc.

Mississippi River Basin Alliance.

Missouri Farmers Union.

Missouri Rural Crisis Center.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture.

National Center for Appropriate Technology.

National Family Farm Coalition.

National Farmers Organization.

Nebraska Wildlife Federation.

New York City Soil and Water Conservation District.

New England Small Farm Institute.

New York Certified Organic, Inc.

New Jersey Environmental Lobby.

New York State Grange.

New York Sustainable Agriculture Working Group (NYSAWG).

Northeast Organic Farming Association-New York.

North Carolina Contract Poultry Growers Association.

Northeast Organic Farming Association of Connecticut (CT).

Northeast Sustainable Agriculture Working Group.

NorthEast Neighborhood Alliance (NY).

Northern Plains Resource Council.

Northern Plains Sustainable Agriculture Society.

Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides.

Nebraska Wildlife Federation.

Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association.

Ohio Environmental Council.

Ohio Family Farm Coalition.

Organic Agriculture Systems Consulting.

Organic Farming Research Foundation.

Organic Independents.

Organic Trade Association.

Organization for Competitive Markets.

PCC Farmland Fund.

Pennsylvania Association for Sustainable Agriculture.

Pennsylvania Certified Organic.

Pesticide Action Network-North America.

Philadelphia Fair Food Project (PA).

Poughkeepsie Farm Project (NY).

Peacemaker Organic Farm (NY).

Provender Alliance (Pacific Northwest).

Regional Food and Farm Project (Northeast).

Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust (NM).

Roby Van En Center (PA).

Rocky Mountain Farmers Union.

Rodale Institute.

Rural Advancement Foundation International-USA.

Rural Coalition/Coalición Rural.

Rural Vermont.

Rural Virginia Inc.

San Juan Citizens Alliance.
Sierra Club Agricultural Committee.
Social Concerns/Rural Life Office Diocese of Jefferson City (MO).
Sophia Garden CSA (NY).
South Central Farmers Market Association (PA).
Southern Research and Development Corp. (LA).
Southern Sustainable Agriculture Working Group.
Students Interested in Sustainable Agricultural (Dickinson College, PA).
Sustainable Agriculture Coalition.
Sustainable Agriculture for Everyone.
Sustainable Earth (IN).
Sustainable Food Center (TX).
Tennessee Land Stewardship Association.
Tuscaloosa CSA (AL).
Tuscarora Organic Growers Cooperative (PA).
Union of Concerned Scientists.
United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society.
Washington Biotechnology Action Council (WA).
Washington Sustainable Food & Farming Network.
Western Organization of Resource Councils.
Western Sustainable Agriculture Working Group.
Willimantic Food Co-op (CT).
Wisconsin Public Interest Research Group
Virginia Biological Farming Association.
Veritable Vegetable (CA).

IN RECOGNITION OF CANADA'S
STEADFAST SUPPORT FOR THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THE
UNITED STATES FOLLOWING
TERRORISTS ATTACKS ON SEP-
TEMBER 11, 2001

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our northern neighbors, the people of Canada.

Next week, I will be addressing the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in Ottawa, Canada. While there, I will have the high honor of meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien and my colleague in the Canadian House of Commons, Speaker Peter Milliken. With both great leaders, I will express our heartfelt thanks for their tremendous support during these challenging times.

At this time, I would like to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two documents sent to me from Speaker Milliken. The first is a letter he wrote to me detailing "the profound sorrow and sympathy" Canadians have for the families and friends of the victims in September 11th's harrowing attack.

The second is a Resolution passed in the House of Commons on Monday, September 17, 2001, that in part reads: the people's body of Canada reaffirms "its commitment to the humane values of free and democratic society and its determination to bring to justice the perpetrators of this attack on these values and to defend civilization from any future terrorist attack."

In closing, I look forward to my meetings with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly so I can personally deliver America's thanks to the leaders of the free world, especially our friends across our northern border, the people of Canada.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Ottawa, Canada, September 19, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, on behalf of all members of the House of Commons of Canada, I would like to convey to you, and to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, the profound sorrow and sympathy of the Canadian people for the families and friends of the victims of the September 11th attack on the United States of America.

At this most difficult time, Canadians and Americans have found solace in the strength and endurance of their friendship. On September 14th, a National Day of Mourning in Canada, I stood with my colleagues from the House, shoulder to shoulder with 100,000 Canadians on the lawn of Parliament Hill in Ottawa, grieving the incalculable loss the world has sustained. Throughout our country, in similar ceremonies, the citizens of Canada echoed, and shared, the sadness of the American people.

The United States and Canada have often taken their relationship for granted; somehow, today, that seems right. There is, after all, much comfort to be had in the unwavering support of our friends during dark times. In fact, former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau once said: "The friendship between our two countries is so basic, so non-negotiable, that it has long since been regarded by others as the standard for enlightened international relations." In the difficult days that lie ahead, I trust you will continue to count on that friendship, as we count on yours.

I have attached the resolution that was adopted by the House of Commons on September 17th, 2001, and signed by the Clerk, as well as the day's Hansard, the transcript of the Commons' proceedings. I hope they will serve to convey to you some of the sentiments expressed by your Canadian colleagues in the House of Commons, as well as their heartfelt hope that the United States will draw strength from its many friends and allies around the world.

Yours truly,

*Peter Milliken,
The Speaker.*

RESOLUTION

Resolved,—That this House express its sorrow and horror at the senseless and vicious attack on the United States of America on September 11, 2001;

That it express its heartfelt condolences to the families of the victims and to the American people; and

That it reaffirm its commitment to the humane values of free and democratic society and its determination to bring to justice the perpetrators of this attack on these values and to defend civilization from any future terrorist attack.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2001.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, relating to animal fighting.

This amendment, which is identical in content to H.R. 1155, would close a loophole in

section 26 of the Animal Welfare Act and bar any interstate shipment of birds for fighting purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in 1976, I joined my colleagues on the floor of the U.S. House in overwhelmingly approving an amendment to the Animal Welfare Act barring any interstate shipment of birds for fighting. Unfortunately, in the conference with the Senate on this legislation, a provision was inserted to allow shipment of fighting birds to States where cockfighting is legal [at that time, there were six States that allowed legal cockfighting].

For the last quarter century, it has become apparent that this loophole has undermined the effectiveness of State bans against cockfighting. Now only three States allow cockfighting, and the loophole in the law allows illegal cockfighters to argue that they possess and train fighting birds and equipment in order to sell the animals and equipment to any one of the three legal cockfighting States. In reality, they are typically making an excuse to conceal their illegal cockfighting operations within their own State. For instance, a cockfighter in Florida or West Virginia, where cockfighting is illegal, can evade scrutiny, and confiscation of fighting animals, by claiming he is going to ship the birds to one of the three legal States. In short, the loophole provides a smokescreen behind which illegal cockfighters operate and undermine the effectiveness of state laws against animal fighting.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment mirrors the provisions of H.R. 1155, a bill introduced by Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota which has 205 bipartisan cosponsors. This measure has been endorsed by 98 law enforcement agencies.

We should note that the legislation has been endorsed by leading animal welfare groups including the Humane Society of the United States and the American Veterinary Medical Association.

While the Animal Welfare Act currently prohibits any interstate movement of dogs for fighting, the prohibition does not apply to birds shipped interstate to fight in the three States where cockfighting is still legal. This loophole should be closed.

Accordingly, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

TRIBUTE TO JACQUELYN C.C.
MENDIOLA

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring attention to an exceptional young woman named Jacquelyn C.C. Mendiola. Jacquelyn, a 16 year-old junior attending George Washington High School in Mangilao, Guam, enjoys music, reading, writing and playing basketball. I bring special attention to her today because of a passionate poem she wrote regarding the September 11 attacks on our nation. Jacquelyn happened to be home sick that day and watched the World Trade Center events in New York on the TV news headlines. Her inspiration came from repeatedly watching the families of victims through